

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

family economics. review

Consumer and Food Economics Research Division
Agricultural Research Service

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

- 3 A Look Ahead in Consumer Affairs
- 5 National Economic Situation and Outlook
- 7 Clothing and Textiles: Supplies, Prices, and
 Outlook for 1970
- 11 The Outlook for Food in 1970
- 13 Cost of Raising a Child
- 17 Family Use of Credit
- 20 Cost of Food at Home
- 23 Some New USDA Publications
- 23 Index of Articles in 1969 Issues
- 25 Family Economics Review Evaluation
 Questionnaire
- 27 Consumer Prices

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

APR 21 1970

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

THE CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

This issue is made up of papers prepared for the National Agricultural Outlook Conference, held in Washington, D.C., February 16 to 19, 1970. The papers on pages 7 and 13 have been considerably condensed. For a copy of the complete text, send your request--giving the title and author of the article--to the Consumer and Food Economics Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Center Building, Hyattsville, Md. 20782. Please give your ZIP code with your return address.

On page 25 you will find a questionnaire about Family Economics Review. We will appreciate it if you will fill it out and mail it to us.

Family Economics Review is a quarterly report on research of the Consumer and Food Economics Research Division and on information from other sources relating to economic aspects of family living. It is developed by Dr. Emma G. Holmes, research family economist, with the cooperation of other staff members of the Division. It is prepared primarily for home economics agents and home economics specialists of the Cooperative Extension Service.

B+ A LOOK AHEAD IN CONSUMER AFFAIRS X

Virginia H. Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs

Today I want to talk about the American marketplace as it relates to the consumer in the cities, . . . on the farms, and in the rural communities. The problems are the same: Unsafe products, shoddy merchandise, shabby repair work, meaningless guarantees, poor service, questionable business practices, and outright swindles.

These problems have caused the consumer revolution we are now witnessing. This consumer revolution does not stop at the city line. It has hit the country road with the same fervor that it has hit Main Street, and with the same impact. As a result, things are happening. Congress is taking action. There are nearly 150 consumer bills pending, and plenty more to come, depending on the issues. The Government--at all levels--is taking action. President Nixon outlined a strong administrative and legislative program in his Consumer Message to Congress. More than 35 States and a number of cities have established consumer protection bureaus.

Industry is taking action. . . . Many business associations--the Grocery Manufacturers of America, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, Better Business Bureaus, and the Chamber of Commerce--just to name a few, have special programs to benefit the consumer. And practically every industry is paying more attention to complaints and services. I don't think this could have happened a decade or two ago. . . . It wasn't until the 1960's that American industry found itself face to face with a consumer movement that was taking root and growing into what it is today--a permanent part of the American scene, here to stay, with not the slightest intention of being gone tomorrow.

And so we are seeing many changes in attitudes--in the attitude of business toward the consumer, in the attitude of law-makers toward business, and in the attitude of Government toward both business and the consumer. The passive policy of the past has been replaced by an active desire to have the consumer and industry go forward together, with both the buyer and the seller enjoying the advantages of the marketplace.

The activities of the present point to an even greater emphasis on a quality marketplace for the future. To help make this possible, President Nixon asked me to be his "pipeline" to the consumer. I see to it that the consumer's voice--your voice--gets to the President. Sometimes he gives me a message to relay back to you, as he did when he supported my fight for lower fat content in hot dogs. But his most comprehensive reply went to you and all 200 million Americans through his Consumer Message to Congress. . . . It was a reply that set the record straight on Administration policy regarding the consumer. In it, the President asked for legislation and administrative reforms that would help honest and conscientious businessmen as well as the buying public. Specifically, the President proposed four legislative measures.

He asked Congress to establish my office as a new permanent, statutory Office of Consumer Affairs, to give every American consumer a permanent voice in the White House. As it is now, my office exists by Executive Order and could be abolished by any future President. Under the President's proposal, my office would continue to play a leading role in the crusade for consumer justice and would be given added duties and powers.

This same legislative measure would also establish a Consumer Protection Division within the Department of Justice to represent consumers before Federal agencies or hearings on complex, legal matters. This new Division would be aided and supported by the 93 U.S. Attorney Offices and 800 U.S. Attorneys in the country.

The Consumer Protection Act would give the new Consumer Protection Division authority to take action against 11 types of fraud and deception which account for 85 percent of all deceptive practices existing in the marketplace. These practices include offering goods or services for sale with the intent not to sell them. This technique is used when the seller advertises "bait" items to attract customers into his store, then switches the customer to a higher priced product. This is known as the "Bait and Switch" swindle. The Consumer Protection Act also would prohibit passing off used goods as new goods, a common practice in low-income neighborhoods. It would prohibit automobile, television, and other repairmen from urging repairs, replacements or services when, to the knowledge of these repairmen, such action is not needed. And it would prohibit misrepresenting the existence of price reductions--a widespread advertising gimmick.

In addition, the Consumer Protection Act provides for class action in Federal courts. This is a new legal remedy for consumer grievances. Once the Justice Department has won a case under the provisions of the new legislation, consumers would be free to unite in class action suits to recover damages. As the President pointed out in his Consumer Message, present Federal law gives private citizens no standing to sue for fraudulent or deceptive practices, and State laws are often not adequate to their problems. Even if private citizens could sue under Federal law, the damage suffered by an individual consumer would not ordinarily be great enough to warrant a costly, individual lawsuit. . . .

The Product Testing Act would assure the consumer that references to product performance characteristics in advertising or labeling of products would be accurate by insuring that the tests to measure these characteristics are up-to-date. As you know, private testing laboratories issue quality endorsements for a wide variety of products. Not all of these endorsements are based on adequate standards. The Federal Government could provide an excellent service to the consumer if it could evaluate the testing procedures on which these private endorsements are based. If no testing standard existed or if the standard used was found to be inadequate, then the appropriate Government agency would be authorized to develop a new one.

In the Drug Identification Code Act, drug manufacturers would be required to print a code number on prescribed drug capsules and containers, so that rapid identification of the drugs would be possible in time of personal emergency. Some drug manufacturers are already doing this on a voluntary basis. This simple, life-saving device should be required of all drug firms.

But legislation is only part of the answer. . . . It's the day-to-day routine, the working together, that helps produce the best results. In my office, for example, we have adopted a new procedure of writing directly to the head of a company when a consumer letter of complaint warrants it. . . . If a gripe is legitimate--and my staff checks out all letters to make sure--we have the power to take direct action. We have been successful in a number of cases. . . . I think we have taken a step in the right direction, and that the results will be well worth the effort, particularly when you consider that our mail now averages more than 2,500 letters a month, and there is no sign of a let-up.

But I don't want to give you the impression that the only consumer complaints we get are the ones that affect industry. There are some very important issues that affect agriculture. . . . My office has received a rash of consumer letters on high egg costs. . . . Housewives are getting angry. They want to know why egg prices have gone up so sharply and they have asked me for some answers. As you know, there are many factors involved here, and they all add up to the fact that prices are up because of short supply and high demand. However, just to make sure, the Commodity Exchange Authority is conducting an investigation of futures trading in shell eggs. The purpose of this investigation is to determine whether there has been any manipulation of futures prices. Such manipulation would be detrimental to both farmers and consumers. . . .

Letters protesting the sale of cancerous chicken . . . started coming after newspapers published the report that, in the future, housewives might be buying chicken minus a leg or a wing that had showed signs of leukosis or cancerlike tumors. They were the angriest letters I have ever received from consumers. Even though there was no proof that the chicken cancer virus could be transmitted to humans, there wasn't a letter from a housewife saying she was willing to take the chance. And neither was I! I assure you, the housewives' protests--including my own personal protest--were promptly registered with the proper authorities. Happily, this issue has been resolved by the Department of Agriculture on behalf of the consumer.

The chicken episode illustrates very well, I think, how effective consumers can be when they make their voices heard on the important issues. We would like to hear from more consumers on any upcoming issues. . . .

Bx NATIONAL ECONOMIC SITUATION AND OUTLOOK +

Rex F. Daly, Economic Research Service, USDA

The Situation

For the past several years, with few exceptions, the economy has been operating near a full employment rate with strong consumer and investment demand, big gains in personal income, and inflationary increases in prices and costs. But, as with most booms, this one seems to be coming to an end.

Gains in Gross National Product (GNP) in real--or output--terms have been smaller each quarter since mid-1968, with no increase at all in the fourth quarter of 1969 even though prices continued to rise. Industrial production has been declining since mid-1969. Housing dropped sharply throughout 1969, except in September. Total non-agricultural employment leveled off, though service-type employment rose. The rate of unemployment remained low through December 1969 then rose sharply in January 1970 to 3.9 percent of the labor force. In recent months, increases in personal incomes were materially slower.

This deceleration of economic activity is largely due to monetary and fiscal efforts to cool inflation. Fiscal measures leveled the rise in Federal expenditures. Since the surtax was imposed in mid-1968, Federal revenues increased enough to turn the

Federal Government account from a substantial deficit in the first half of 1968 to a sizable surplus in 1969. This turnabout partially offset demand pressures. The sharp decline in homebuilding and the reluctance of consumers to buy some big-ticket durable goods in 1969 apparently was due largely to tight money and expensive credit.

Although activity in some sectors slowed, overall demand increased in 1969. Business outlays for new plants and equipment quickened; expenditures by State and local governments expanded; and consumers spent most of their rising incomes for services and nondurable goods. The result was a continued rise in prices and costs during most of 1969.

The Outlook for 1970

The consensus in recent months as to forecasts for 1970 calls for: (1) A slowing in economic activity but no recession; (2) no real growth in output during the first half of 1970 and a moderate pickup during the last half; and (3) some easing of inflationary pressures on prices and costs, particularly later in the year.

Most estimates of GNP for 1970 range from \$980 to \$990 billion. Some recent forecasts exceed \$990 billion. On the other hand, a few economists have predicted a recession. Recent trends may bring more forecasts below the "consensus range," along with appeals for countermeasures. Thus, the 1970 forecast may be uniquely uncertain because of the difficulty of anticipating fiscal and monetary actions that may be adopted to cool inflation and yet avoid reducing demand, output, and employment too much.

Government purchases are scheduled to rise in 1970, but much more slowly than in recent years. The reduction scheduled in defense outlays more than offsets the small gain expected in nondefense outlays. Cuts are already being felt in defense, space, and construction industries. Expenditures by State and local governments will rise about as much in 1970 as in 1969.

Business investment plans point to a continued but less rapid rise in fixed capital outlays through mid-1970. A slowdown is likely because credit is expensive and scarce, plant operating rates are the lowest in years, and prospects for sales and profits are not very promising. Tight money and rising building costs will likely curtail home building further, despite strong demand for housing.

Consumer expenditures will make sizable overall gains in 1970. Most forecasts predict sluggish markets for consumer durable goods and some cutback for automobiles. Expenditures for food, other nondurable goods, and services will likely rise. Gains in consumer expenditures are based largely on prospects for higher after-tax incomes. The effect on income of a slower growth in economic activity will, according to most forecasts, be much more than offset by lower taxes and higher social security payments. These may be adding \$12 or \$13 billion (annual rate) to after-tax consumer income by the last half of 1970.

Forecasts for real output in 1970 vary from only small gains--especially through the first half--to modest cutbacks extending beyond midyear and practically no increase for the year. Forecasts indicate some rise in unemployment. They also show a little slower rise in consumer prices.

Fiscal and monetary developments and action relating to Vietnam and such domestic problems as poverty, crime, and pollution will be important in shaping the outlook for 1970 and beyond.

Virginia Britton, Agricultural Research Service, USDA

Clothing Expenditures and Prices

Expenditures. -- Expenditures per capita for clothing and shoes reached an all-time high in 1968 of \$230. Preliminary data indicate that this record was broken in 1969. Per capita clothing expenditures will probably rise again in 1970 if incomes increase as expected. Another reason these expenditures may be higher is that a larger proportion of the population will be in the 15- to 24-year age group, which usually spends more than other groups do for clothing.

The increase in expenditures for clothing and shoes is due in part to higher prices and in part to increased real consumption of these items. Spending per capita in dollars of constant buying power rose 1.6 percent in 1968 and probably a fraction of 1 percent in 1969. A rise similar to that in 1969 is likely in 1970.

Prices. -- After trailing for many years, the index of prices for apparel has risen for 3 years now at a faster rate than the all-items index of the Consumer Price Index. The apparel index was 5.8 percent higher for 1969 than for 1968, the all-items index 5.4 percent higher (see table). As often occurred in the 1960's, price increases in 1969 were less for women's and girls' apparel than for footwear and for men's and boys' apparel. The respective increases from 1968 to 1969 were 5.5, 6.1, and 6.4 percent.

Supplies of Fabrics and Raw Materials

Total fibers. -- The quantity of fibers used per person in the United States is estimated to be about 49.0 pounds in 1969, up from 48.6 pounds in 1968. The increase was almost entirely in manmade fibers. In 1969, manmade fibers accounted for about 57 percent of total fibers used, cotton 40 percent, and wool 3 percent.

Cotton. -- The U.S. cotton crop in 1969 is estimated to furnish at least 93 percent of expected use in domestic mills and export during the 1969-70 season. Cotton in stocks will supply the deficit. Use of U.S. cotton in 1969-70 is expected to be a little lower than in 1968-69 and the least since 1938. Increased use of blends of manmade fibers with cotton, reduced military purchases of cotton textiles, and large cotton textile imports are contributing to the decline.

Changes in relative prices of fibers have also contributed to the decline in use of cotton in recent years. Cotton prices hit a peak in December 1967. The net price for cotton, after waste, was considerably higher than the cotton-equivalent price of rayon and almost as high as the cotton-equivalent price of polyester. The price of cotton has dropped considerably since late 1967, but the decline has been largely matched by greater discounts for manmade fibers.

Wool. -- U.S. mills have reduced their use of apparel wool since winter 1968-69 because of increased use of manmade fibers, a lower rate of advance in consumer incomes, slightly higher prices of raw wool, and decreased military orders. The amount of apparel wool used in 1969 was about 8 percent less than in 1968. World production of apparel wool is expected to be about the same in 1969-70 as in 1968-69. Mill use in

Percentage change in selected annual indexes of consumer prices

Index	1965 to 1966	1966 to 1967	1967 to 1968	1968 to 1969
Consumer Price Index -----	+2.9	+2.8	+4.2	+5.4
Apparel and Upkeep Index <u>1/</u>	+2.6	+4.0	+5.4	+5.8
Men's and boys' apparel --	+2.7	+3.6	+5.7	+6.4
Women's and girls' apparel	+1.9	+4.6	+5.9	+5.5
Footwear -----	+5.9	+4.9	+5.3	+6.1

1/ Also includes infants' wear, sewing materials, jewelry, and apparel upkeep services, for which separate indexes are not available.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

1970 may total about the same as in 1969. Competition from manmade fibers is expected to increase, but lower raw wool prices and larger consumer incomes will aid the use of wool.

Manmade fibers.--U.S. mills used about 8 percent more manmade fibers in 1969 than in 1968. A further increase is likely in 1970. U.S. producing capacity for manmade fibers is expected to be 17 percent higher in December 1970 than in March 1969. Most of the larger capacity will be for noncellulosic fibers, particularly polyester, and a small part will be for rayon and acetate. Manmade fibers have gained markets by large-scale promotion and advertising, more competitive prices, increased supplies, and improved technology. Blends of manmade fibers with cotton, wool, or other manmade--such as polyester with rayon--have played an important part in the growing use of manmade fibers. Polyester-cotton blends amounted to about one-fifth of total production of cotton broadwoven goods (including cotton blends) in 1968 and probably almost one-fourth in 1969. In the first 11 months of 1969, about 49 percent of total fibers used by U.S. woolen and worsted mills were manmade.

Leather.--U.S. production of hides (cattle and calves), which was about the same in 1969 as in 1968, will probably increase slightly in 1970. Prices rose in 1969, largely due to strong world demand. Continued high demand in 1970 will support high prices, but generally below the levels of spring 1969. U.S. production of the more important types of leather declined about 8 percent from 1960 to 1969, while imports and production of leather substitutes increased. U.S. tanners import about one-half of the raw calf and sheep skins they use, and most of the goat and exotic skins--such as alligator, lizard, and deer. Imports of leather and of finished leather products, such as footwear and handbags, have also increased. Because of the high price of leather and increased production of leather substitutes, the proportion of U.S.-made shoes in which leather is used is decreasing. About 71 percent of U.S.-made shoes had leather or part-leather uppers in 1969 compared with 83 percent in 1960. Only 19 percent in 1969 had leather soles.

Outlook for 1970.--Supplies of clothing and textiles in 1970 will be large and varied. Producers of manmade fibers and leather substitutes will use enlarged plant capacity and promotional campaigns to intensify competition with the natural fibers and leather. Manufacturers and retailers of clothing and textiles will be under extra pres-

sure to save on purchases, labor, and inventories. However, apparel and shoes will probably come on the retail market in 1970 at higher prices than in 1969.

New Developments

Flame-resistant fabrics.--The revised Flammable Fabrics Act of December 1967 gave the U.S. Department of Commerce authority to develop flammability standards when the need exists to protect the public from unreasonable risk of death, injury, or economic loss from fires. In December 1969, the Department issued a proposed flammability standard for carpets and rugs--the first standard under the revised act. Rugs and carpets meet the standard if, in a controlled test, a fire goes out after spreading less than 3 inches. The National Bureau of Standards developed the standard in cooperation with consumer, industry, and scientific groups. They tested samples of 43 different carpets and rugs and found that almost two-thirds would be classed as "resistant to flammability" under the proposed standard. After comments received on the proposed standard have been evaluated by the Department of Commerce, a final decision will be made. If adopted, the flammability standard would apply to all carpets available in this country.

In January 1970, the Department of Commerce issued notice that a flammability standard may be needed for children's sleepwear, underwear, and dresses. Children under 6 years of age are injured by clothing fires more often than most other age groups. The flammability standard would apply to sleepwear, underwear, and dresses through size 6X and to all fabrics and related materials expected to be used for such apparel.

Industry can provide fire-retardant treatment for cotton, which makes up 85 to 90 percent of children's nightwear. However, the chemicals are relatively expensive and they increase the weight of the fabric, which affects "hand" (feel and drapability) of the fabric to some extent. Two processes of durable fire-retardant treatment for cotton for consumer goods are available. These processes should become cheaper if they get into volume production. Industry is seeking a satisfactory flame-retardant treatment for blends of cotton with more than 35 percent polyester. A rayon with a flame-retardant compound incorporated in the fiber is available, and work is being done to develop inherently flame-retardant polyester, acrylic, and nylon fibers. Some flame-retardant treated garments are available. For example, a mail order company and some stores offer a few items of children's wear that have such treatment.

The Department of Commerce expects soon to issue notice that a flammability standard may be needed for bedding. Its research indicates a need for a retardant to prevent smoldering that causes deaths by asphyxiation, as when a mattress is ignited by a burning cigarette.

Labeling of textile products.--Two changes have recently been made in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act: (1) A rule that went into effect in August 1969 requires that if two manmade fibers are combined in the liquid stage into a single fiber, the label on the fiber product must state that it is a biconstituent or multiconstituent fiber and show the percentage of each fiber; and (2) an amendment that went into effect in November 1969 added a new generic name--anidex--to the list of names used to identify textile products. Anidex is a stretch fiber and is the first wholly new fiber added since the act went into effect in 1960.

For manmade fibers there are now 17 generic (general or family) names that must be used in labeling, except where two specific names may be used when the fiber fulfills the requirements. The generic names are as follows:

Cellulosic

Acetate

Triacetate 1/

Rayon

Noncellulosic

Acrylic

Anidex

Azlon 2/

Glass

Metallic

Modacrylic

Nylon

Nytril 2/

Olefin

Polyester

Rubber

Lastrile 2/ 3/

Saran

Spandex

Vinal 2/

Vinyon

These generic names, which may be accompanied by registered trade marks, are required on labels on wearing apparel, yard goods, draperies, furnishings, rugs, and bedding sold in interstate commerce. The label must show the percentage by weight, in decreasing order, of all fibers that are 5 percent or more of the total, and may mention fibers that are less than 5 percent if they have a functional significance. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) strives to investigate reports of improper labeling under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Wool Products and Fur Products Labeling Acts.

The FTC has proposed Trade Regulation Rules requiring that labels telling how to care for and clean fabrics be sewn to textile products. When such information is given it is usually on a detachable label or tag that may be lost shortly after purchase. The proposed FTC rule states that it is unfair competition and a deceptive practice to sell in commerce any textile product that does not have a permanently attached label giving clear instructions for proper laundering, cleaning, care, and use. Public hearings on the proposal were set for January and March 1970.

Product developments.--USDA's Southern Utilization Research and Development Division (SURDD) is working on several finishes to improve the durable press properties of cotton fabrics. One effort is to develop a commercially feasible continuous operation steam-cure process, based on a batch steam-cure process widely used in Europe. The steam-cure process may mean all-cotton durable press garments will be about as comfortable as untreated cotton garments. Steam-cure fabrics have better strength retention and abrasion resistance than those treated by conventional processes, but wrinkle recovery is so far about the same.

One process being developed at SURDD but not yet ready for commercial use is expected to produce cottons that dry smoothly when hung on the line damp rather than dripping wet. This will mean that garments can be hung on a line straight from the

1/ May be used instead of acetate when fiber fulfills requirements.

2/ Not produced in the United States.

3/ May be used instead of rubber when fiber fulfills requirements.

washer instead of being tumble-dried in a dryer--a big help to the 62 percent of U.S. households without dryers. (Only 30 percent are without washers.) The new finishing process involves wetting the fabric with a chemical solution, then curing at relatively low temperatures.

The growing use of knit goods has prompted research to improve the properties of cotton knits. Simulated trouser cuffs from circular knit cotton fabric treated with finishing agents used for durable-press woven fabrics retained their shape, creases, and smooth, well-tailored appearance even after 30 launderings at SURDD. The cuffs showed little evidence of damage due to abrasion.

SURDD has shown that mercerizing yarn reduces loss of strength in wash-wear cotton knits and woven fabrics. Unusually high-strength retention results when wash-wear finish is applied to woven fabrics made from slack-mercerized cotton yarns.

Creases can be made in or eliminated from durable press fabrics by multiple ironings with wetting steps in between, according to tests at SURDD. Equally effective for making creases were ironing at the "linen" setting for three 30-second periods when the fabric was wet with a chemical and for six 15-second periods when it was wet with water. For eliminating creases, three 60-second ironings of fabrics wet with chemical were more effective than multiple ironings of fabrics wet with water.

Machine washable wools may soon be available in loosely constructed knitwear and woven goods. A treatment being developed at the USDA's Western Utilization Research and Development Division (WURDD) produces materials that do not shrink in machine washing or tumble drying and that retain their shape and appearance even after repeated use. Commercial development is underway by a manufacturer of men's knitted outerwear.

Wool and mohair fibers (from Angora goats) are improved by a treatment that cuts the slickness that has been a major obstacle to making mohair into fabric. The tensile strength of the yarn is increased and yarns may be spun more efficiently. The modified fibers are shrink- and soil-resistant. They absorb water faster than untreated fibers and feel slightly harsh to the touch, but these drawbacks can be overcome by chemical treatments WURDD has developed.

WURDD is developing a method of determining consumer attitudes toward "hand" of fabrics. Panelists will rate fabrics for a specified use as to roughness-smoothness, stiffness-flexibility, heaviness-lightness, and coolness-warmth. The ratings will be in terms usable by manufacturers and will help them to produce fabrics that will be pleasing to consumers.

Bx THE OUTLOOK FOR FOOD IN 1970 x

Robert M. Walsh, Economic Research Service, USDA

Americans ate a record amount of food per person in 1969 and paid about 5 percent higher prices for it than in 1968. In 1970, despite the slight increase likely in food supplies per person, retail prices will again rise--perhaps 3 1/2 to 4 percent--reflecting continued strong demand.

Most of the gain in food consumption in 1969 was in the crop foods. Consumption per person was nearly the same as in 1968 for meat and fish, larger for poultry, and smaller for eggs and dairy products. Continuing trends of recent years, per capita consumption declined for animal fats and increased for vegetable oils. Other notable increases were in fresh and processed fruits and processed potato products.

Food from Livestock

Red meat production was at a record level in 1969, but supplies did not keep pace with population growth. Consumption of red meat per person was 182 pounds compared with the record 183 pounds in 1968. Beef consumption rose about 1 pound in 1969, but consumption of all other red meats declined. Consumer demand for meat was unusually strong because of higher consumer incomes and general inflationary pressures. Retail meat prices rose sharply, especially in late spring and summer. Although prices have moderated since, the Bureau of Labor Statistics index of retail prices for meat averaged 9 percent higher for 1969 than 1968.

In the first half of 1970, per capita consumption of red meat will likely be slightly lower than a year earlier. Increased beef consumption will be more than offset by reduced consumption of pork and veal. Retail prices in the first few months of 1970 will probably continue around fall 1969 levels and well above prices in early 1969. Pork prices will be up substantially.

Egg production in the first half of 1970 likely will be 2 to 3 percent higher than a year earlier. Egg prices, which in early winter were the highest since the early 1950's, are expected to ease as production increases. However, they will continue above year-earlier levels until later in 1970.

Broiler meat production in 1970 is expected to be above 1969. The margin will likely be narrower during the last 3 quarters than the first quarter. Retail prices for broilers are expected to ease somewhat, and may average below 1969 levels.

Turkey meat production during 1970 is expected to be up substantially. However, cold storage holdings of turkeys on January 1 were one-third below those of a year earlier. January-to-June turkey prices likely will average moderately higher in 1970 than in 1969.

U.S. milk production may decline again in 1970. Output in 1969 was down 1 percent from 1968 and carry-in stocks in 1970 were smaller than in 1969. Per capita use of milk may continue to decline. Consumption of milk per person declined about 2 percent in 1969 to an estimated 565 pounds. Most of the decrease was in butter, whole milk, cream, and evaporated milk. Use per person of low-fat fluid milk and cheese rose sharply.

Food from Crops

Supplies of wheat, rye, and rice are large. Retail prices of cereal and bakery products will likely continue the gradual upward trend associated with increasing market costs.

Consumption of wheat flour is likely to change little in 1970 from the 110 pounds per person used in 1969. Consumption of milled rice is likely to rise above the 8.3 pounds per person used in the 1968-69 marketing year.

Supplies of fresh vegetables are smaller in winter 1969-70 than a year earlier, and prices are considerably higher. Production is lower for a number of hardy vegetables, including cabbage, carrots, and celery. Freezing temperatures in the South have caused moderate to severe damage to tender crops such as snap beans, green peppers, cucumbers, sweet corn, and tomatoes. As usual, domestic production of a number of vegetables will be supplemented by imports, mainly from Mexico where winter supplies are reported to be up moderately.

Supplies of canned and frozen vegetables are relatively large, for big carryover stocks largely offset reduced packs. Prices, though higher than in 1969, are expected to remain at moderate levels. Consumption in 1970 likely will approximate 1969's record. Potato supplies are a little larger for winter 1969-70 than the previous winter due to heavier storage holdings.

Supplies of most fresh and processed fruits are expected to be substantially higher during the first half of the year in 1970 than 1969. Retail fruit prices during the first half year are likely to average slightly lower in 1970 than in 1969.

Supplies of dry edible beans are up moderately. Most of the increase is in white beans, which are lower in retail price than in 1969. Reduced supplies of colored beans have raised their prices. Dry pea supplies are the largest in several years. Prices of dry peas have been down but will likely rise somewhat if exports continue high.

Bx COST OF RAISING A CHILD x

Jean L. Pennock, Agricultural Research Service, USDA

In 1966, the Consumer and Food Economics Research Division developed estimates of the cost of raising a child from birth to age 18 on farms in the South and the North Central regions. The method of making such estimates has since been refined. Costs have been developed by region for a farm, rural nonfarm, and urban child, each in a family with not more than five children and with food expenditures at the level of USDA's low-cost food plan. This food expenditure sets the general economic level of the family and results in the selection of families at a comparable level of living, for families can be assumed to apply the same standards to their spending for food and for other goods and services.

The data used to develop the cost estimates came from the 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures, conducted by the USDA and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Costs for each of the child's first 18 years and for the entire 18-year period were first estimated in 1960-61 prices, then updated to 1969 prices. These costs at 1969 prices for an urban child in the type of family described above and living in the North Central region appear in table 1.^{1/} Tables 2 and 3 give costs at 1969 prices for all urbanizations and regions. Costs have also been computed for a child born in 1951 and reaching age 17 in 1968, to reflect price changes each year during his childhood (table 4).

^{1/} The paper from which this article was condensed gives costs at 1961 and 1969 prices for farm, rural nonfarm, and urban children in the specified type of family in each region (except farm children for the West).

Table 1.--Estimated costs, in 1969 prices, for raising an urban child in the North Central region, by age of child, first 18 years
[In family of husband, wife, and no more than 5 children, with food expenditures at level of low-cost food plan]

Age of child (years)	Total cost	Food	Clothing	Housing 1/	Medical care	Educa- tion	Trans- porta- tion	All other 2/	Aver- age family size
	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Persons
Under 1 ----	1,130	190	60	460	60	0	230	130	4.8
1 -----	1,170	230	60	460	60	0	230	130	4.8
2 -----	1,080	220	90	390	60	0	200	120	5.5
3 -----	1,080	220	90	390	60	0	200	120	5.5
4 -----	1,140	280	90	390	60	0	200	120	5.5
5 -----	1,140	280	90	390	60	0	200	120	5.5
6 -----	1,170	280	130	360	60	20	190	130	5.8
7 -----	1,220	330	130	360	60	20	190	130	5.8
8 -----	1,220	330	130	360	60	20	190	130	5.8
9 -----	1,220	330	130	360	60	20	190	130	5.8
10 -----	1,270	380	130	360	60	20	190	130	5.8
11 -----	1,270	380	130	360	60	20	190	130	5.8
12 -----	1,340	380	180	360	60	20	200	140	5.6
13 -----	1,380	420	180	360	60	20	200	140	5.6
14 -----	1,380	420	180	360	60	20	200	140	5.6
15 -----	1,380	420	180	360	60	20	200	140	5.6
16 -----	1,550	470	250	380	60	20	220	150	5.3
17 -----	1,550	470	250	380	60	20	220	150	5.3
Total ---	22,690	6,030	2,480	6,840	1,080	240	3,640	2,380	-

Note: Data rounded to nearest \$10.

1/ Includes shelter; fuel, light, refrigeration, and water; household operations; and furnishings and equipment.

2/ Includes personal care, recreation, reading, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Whether you will want to use cost estimates in constant dollars--that is, costs for all ages in prices of a single year--or in current dollars--prices varying with the year--will depend on the use you plan to make of them. Costs in constant dollars are useful to persons considering allowances for present costs, such as welfare workers planning allowances for the support of dependent children; lawyers and courts adjudicating support for children; and research workers considering the present cost of supporting the youth of the country or a part of it. The lawyer and court considering past costs met in raising a child will want costs in current dollars, to reflect prices in the years the child was growing up. So will the research worker interested in past costs for a cohort of persons.

At the low-cost level being used in this article, estimated costs in 1969 dollars for the first 18 years of life range from \$19,360 for a rural nonfarm child in the North Central region to \$25,000 for a rural nonfarm child in the West. These costs compare with costs ranging from \$15,800 to \$20,190 for a child born in 1951, at prices current in each year through his childhood. Here, also, the extremes are a rural nonfarm child in the North Central region and in the West.

Proportion of Family Income Required per Child

Although costs vary considerably according to where the child lives, some generalizations about the proportion of family income required per child are possible. Over

Table 2.--Estimated costs, in 1969 prices, for a child's first 18 years, by region and urbanization
[In family of husband, wife, and no more than 5 children, with food expenditures
at level of low-cost food plan]

Region and urbanization	Total costs	Food	Clothing	Housing 1/	Medical care	Educa- tion	Trans- portation	All other 2/
	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.
Northeast								
Farm -----	19,770	6,110	2,180	5,500	1,080	120	3,020	1,760
Rural nonfarm -	23,070	6,070	2,500	6,880	920	240	3,920	2,540
Urban -----	19,520	6,180	2,200	5,880	900	120	2,460	1,780
South								
Farm -----	21,690	5,530	2,600	5,940	1,080	240	3,940	2,360
Rural nonfarm -	21,050	5,510	2,400	5,980	920	120	3,900	2,220
Urban -----	21,360	5,600	2,400	6,340	1,080	240	3,320	2,380
North Central								
Farm -----	19,460	5,220	2,440	5,400	1,080	240	3,060	2,020
Rural nonfarm -	19,360	5,380	2,240	5,600	900	120	3,280	1,840
Urban -----	22,690	6,030	2,480	6,840	1,080	240	3,640	2,380
West 3/								
Rural nonfarm -	25,000	6,060	2,640	6,900	1,260	220	4,780	3,140
Urban -----	23,380	6,300	2,340	6,920	1,280	120	3,780	2,640

Note: Data rounded to nearest \$10.

1/ 2/ See footnotes 1 and 2 to Table 1.

3/ Data for farm child in West not available.

the first 18 years, costs per child--in constant dollars at the time of the survey in 1960-61--took from 14 to 17 percent of family income. The percentage was lowest for the farm child in the Northeast and North Central regions. Incomes in these areas had to be spread to cover somewhat more children than elsewhere.

Annual Variations Because of Age of Child

The cost per year for raising a child generally increases as he grows, even without taking account of the effect of price changes over his lifetime. In 1969 dollars, costs in the 18th year are about 30 to 45 percent higher than in the first year.

Price changes over the life of a child may increase the variation in annual costs. For example, consider the child born in 1951. In 1951 and 1952, the Korean crisis caused a sharp rise in prices. Food and clothing prices dropped somewhat after that, but by 1957 average prices for the groups of goods and services shown in tables 1 and 2 were all back to the 1951 levels or higher. Since 1957 the price trend has been generally upward, and the rate of increase has been rising. As a result, costs for the child's 18th year in 1968 dollars are 75 to 94 percent higher than costs for his first year in 1951 dollars. This is more than double the difference in 1969 dollars.

Costs for the various categories of goods and services in the family budget do not all rise at the same rate over the life span of the child. Costs rise most sharply for food and clothing, the categories for which we have the best basis for estimating cost per person (USDA food plans for food and data on clothing for individuals from the Survey of Consumer Expenditures). No data are available on the shares of housing, transportation, and miscellaneous goods and services used by each family member. Therefore, the cost assigned the child is his per capita share of these categories. When costs are assigned in this way and family spending does not vary in relation to family size,

Table 3.--Estimated costs for a child, in 1969 prices, by age of child, region, and urbanization
[In family of husband, wife, and no more than 5 children, with food expenditures
at level of low-cost food plan]

Age of child (years)	Farm 1/			Rural nonfarm				Urban			
	North Central	South	North- east	North Central	South	North- east	West	North Central	South	North- east	West
	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.
Under 1 ----	920	1,040	930	970	1,100	1,100	1,250	1,130	1,080	930	1,150
1 -----	950	1,080	970	1,000	1,140	1,140	1,300	1,170	1,120	970	1,190
2 -----	910	1,040	920	910	1,000	1,080	1,190	1,080	1,030	930	1,110
3 -----	910	1,040	920	910	1,000	1,080	1,190	1,080	1,030	930	1,110
4 -----	960	1,100	980	960	1,060	1,130	1,250	1,140	1,080	990	1,170
5 -----	960	1,100	980	960	1,060	1,130	1,250	1,140	1,080	990	1,170
6 -----	1,000	1,130	1,020	990	1,080	1,200	1,290	1,170	1,090	1,000	1,220
7 -----	1,040	1,170	1,070	1,030	1,120	1,250	1,340	1,220	1,140	1,050	1,270
8 -----	1,040	1,170	1,070	1,030	1,120	1,250	1,340	1,220	1,140	1,050	1,270
9 -----	1,040	1,170	1,070	1,030	1,120	1,250	1,340	1,220	1,140	1,050	1,270
10 -----	1,090	1,220	1,130	1,080	1,170	1,310	1,390	1,270	1,190	1,110	1,330
11 -----	1,090	1,220	1,130	1,080	1,170	1,310	1,390	1,270	1,190	1,110	1,330
12 -----	1,200	1,300	1,200	1,170	1,250	1,400	1,500	1,340	1,280	1,180	1,400
13 -----	1,230	1,330	1,240	1,200	1,280	1,440	1,540	1,380	1,310	1,210	1,430
14 -----	1,230	1,330	1,240	1,200	1,280	1,440	1,540	1,380	1,310	1,210	1,430
15 -----	1,230	1,330	1,240	1,200	1,280	1,440	1,540	1,380	1,310	1,210	1,430
16 -----	1,330	1,460	1,330	1,320	1,410	1,560	1,680	1,550	1,420	1,300	1,550
17 -----	1,330	1,460	1,330	1,320	1,410	1,560	1,680	1,550	1,420	1,300	1,550
Total ---	19,460	21,690	19,770	19,360	21,050	23,070	25,000	22,690	21,360	19,520	23,380

Note: Data rounded to nearest \$10.

1/ Data for West not available.

Table 4.--Estimated costs, in prices of year specified, for a child born January 1, 1951, by age of child
[In family of husband, wife, and no more than 5 children, with food expenditures
at level of low-cost food plan]

Age of child (years)	Year	Farm 1/			Rural nonfarm				Urban			
		North Central	South	North- east	North Central	South	North- east	West	North Central	South	North- east	West
		Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.
Under 1 ----	1951	650	730	660	680	770	780	870	790	760	650	800
1 -----	1952	690	780	710	730	820	830	930	840	810	700	860
2 -----	1953	670	760	680	670	750	800	860	800	760	680	810
3 -----	1954	670	770	680	670	750	800	860	800	760	680	810
4 -----	1955	710	800	720	700	780	840	910	830	790	720	860
5 -----	1956	720	820	730	710	790	850	920	850	800	730	870
6 -----	1957	770	870	790	760	830	920	980	890	840	770	930
7 -----	1958	830	930	850	820	890	990	1,050	960	900	840	1,000
8 -----	1959	840	940	860	830	900	1,000	1,060	970	910	840	1,020
9 -----	1960	850	950	870	840	910	1,010	1,080	980	920	850	1,030
10 -----	1961	890	1,000	930	890	960	1,070	1,130	1,030	970	910	1,080
11 -----	1962	910	1,020	940	900	970	1,080	1,150	1,040	980	920	1,100
12 -----	1963	1,010	1,100	1,010	990	1,050	1,180	1,260	1,130	1,070	1,000	1,180
13 -----	1964	1,050	1,140	1,060	1,030	1,090	1,220	1,310	1,180	1,110	1,040	1,230
14 -----	1965	1,070	1,160	1,080	1,050	1,110	1,240	1,330	1,190	1,120	1,060	1,250
15 -----	1966	1,100	1,190	1,110	1,080	1,140	1,280	1,370	1,230	1,160	1,090	1,280
16 -----	1967	1,210	1,340	1,230	1,200	1,300	1,440	1,530	1,410	1,280	1,200	1,420
17 -----	1968	1,260	1,390	1,270	1,250	1,350	1,490	1,590	1,470	1,340	1,240	1,480
Total ---		15,900	17,690	16,180	15,800	17,160	18,820	20,190	18,390	17,280	15,920	19,010

Note: Data rounded to nearest \$10.

1/ Data for West not available.

costs per child tend to drop as family size increases and to rise again when the child is a teenager and has fewer brothers and sisters at home. This pattern is evident for housing and transportation costs.

Cost per child in constant (1969) dollars increased more for food and clothing than for other budget categories between the child's 1st and 18th year.

Relative Importance of the Budget Categories

In general, housing takes a larger share of the total annual cost than any other category over the child's first 18 years--up to 30 percent. Food is a close second, and for farm and urban children in the Northeast it exceeds housing. Clothing and the miscellaneous category that includes recreation and personal care usually take 10 to 12 percent each, and transportation takes somewhat more. Medical care takes 4 to 6 percent and education about 1 percent. (College expense incurred before age 18 is not included here.)

Rural-Urban Differences

When levels of living are held constant, costs in the South are about the same for the farm, rural nonfarm, and urban child. In the North Central region, however, costs are appreciably higher for the urban child than for the farm or rural nonfarm child. In the Northeast and West they are higher for the rural nonfarm than either the urban or farm child. Food and housing costs are generally higher and transportation costs lower for urban than rural children in the same region. These variations are due in part to differences in choices families make because of their different needs and preferences, and in part to variations in price levels.

More Information Available

The report upon which this article was based tells how the estimates of the cost of raising a child were made and includes detailed tables showing costs by region for farm, rural nonfarm, and urban children in 1961 dollars and 1969 dollars.

Bx FAMILY USE OF CREDIT +

Katherine D. Smythe, Agricultural Research Service, USDA

Consumer credit is becoming an increasingly important factor in family finance as more families use it in larger amounts and in a greater number of forms. For some families credit is a useful tool; for others it becomes a burden and a source of worry. Which it will be is determined largely by the thought and planning that goes into its use and the family's understanding of the responsibilities it involves.

Information about how families make decisions on credit use is needed as background for developing aids to family financial management. In 1969, the Consumer and Food Economics Research Division and the College of Home Economics of Oklahoma State University conducted a study to obtain this type of information. Enid, Okla., a

city of about 45,000 population, was the area surveyed. The sample included only husband-wife families in which the couple had been married a year or more and the husband was under 45 years old. This age group was selected because, according to previous studies, younger families are more likely to be using credit than older ones.

The majority of the questions in the interview were on decision-making in the use of credit, since this type of information was the main object of the survey. As background, some questions were asked about credit transactions made, types of credit used, and amounts paid on consumer debts between July 1, 1968 and June 30, 1969--the survey year. This report gives preliminary data from this part of the survey. (Debts for purchase of a home were excluded from the study.)

The families.--The survey included 365 families. About 20 percent of these had a husband under 25 years old and 40 percent each a husband 25 to 34 and 35 to 44 years. About three-fourths of the families had after-tax incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000. The rest were fairly evenly divided between those with incomes lower and higher than this. The wives in one-half of the families were employed at full-time or part-time jobs. Families of 3 or 4 members were about one-half of the total and families of 5 or more about one-third.

Payments on consumer debts.--About 4 out of 5 of the 365 families made payments during the schedule year on consumer debts assumed that year or still unpaid from an earlier year. The older families (husband 35 to 44 years old) and those with more income and education were a little less likely than others to be paying on debts. Families with nonemployed wives were less likely to be making payments than those with employed wives.

The amounts paid on debt averaged \$634 for the families surveyed and \$806 for those making payments. Families with incomes of \$10,000 and over paid more than those with less income, and families with employed wives paid more than those with wives who were full-time homemakers.

The percentages of income after tax allocated to payments on consumer debts by the 365 families surveyed were as follows:

<u>Percent of income (after tax)</u> <u>paid on consumer debts</u>	<u>Percent of</u> <u>families</u>
None (no debts) -----	21
Less than 5 -----	16
5 to 9 -----	19
10 to 14 -----	18
15 to 19 -----	13
20 or more -----	12
Not known -----	1 ¹ / ₂

Families with incomes under \$5,000 were more likely than those with larger amounts to be paying 20 percent or more of income on consumer debts.

¹/₂ Includes 5 families who were making payments but gave no information on income.

Credit transactions. -- Of the 365 families surveyed 211 or 58 percent reported one or more credit transactions of \$100 or more during the year. Almost 60 percent of these made only one credit transaction, 25 percent made two, and 15 percent made three or more.

Families making only one credit transaction of \$100 or more used loans in 56 percent of these transactions, the installment purchase plan in 40 percent, and a charge account in 4 percent. Families with income under \$5,000 were the only ones who used the installment plan more than a loan. (In this paper, "installment plan" refers to credit arranged with the retailer making the sale; "charge account" refers to what is often called a revolving or budget account--that is, an account to be paid in monthly payments over a period of time with interest added.)

Families making two or more credit transactions during the year were more likely to use two types of credit than one, and none used all three types. Most often used was a combination of loan and installment purchase plans. Use of charge accounts may have been limited by the kinds of goods financed--for example, cars--and the amount of credit involved--\$100 or more--per transaction.

More of the loans used were from banks than from all other sources combined. Loans used by families with income under \$5,000 were an exception, for about as many of them were from loan companies as from banks.

Like families in many earlier studies, few knew the rate of interest being charged on the consumer debts they assumed during the year. When asked what the interest rate was, the answer was "don't know" for 67 percent of the credit transactions. Many more families seemed to know the extra dollar cost of credit than knew the interest rate.

Future Work

These findings are a small part of the information to be obtained from this study. They will serve as a background for the data on family decision making which are being tabulated at Oklahoma State University under the direction of Dr. Florence McKinney, project leader at OSU.

COST OF FOOD AT HOME

Cost of food at home estimated for food plans at three
cost levels, December 1969, U.S. average 1/

Sex-age groups <u>2/</u>	Cost for 1 week			Cost for 1 month		
	Low-cost plan	Moderate- cost plan	Liberal plan	Low-cost plan	Moderate- cost plan	Liberal plan
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
<u>FAMILIES</u>						
Family of 2:						
20 to 35 years <u>3/</u> ----	18.20	23.10	28.30	78.60	100.20	122.60
55 to 75 years <u>3/</u> ----	14.80	19.40	23.10	64.50	83.80	100.40
Family of 4:						
Preschool children <u>4/</u>	26.40	33.60	40.80	114.40	145.80	177.10
School children <u>5/</u> ---	30.60	39.20	47.90	132.70	169.80	207.80
<u>INDIVIDUALS <u>6/</u></u>						
Children, under 1 year	3.60	4.50	5.00	15.50	19.50	21.90
1 to 3 years -----	4.50	5.70	6.80	19.60	24.70	29.60
3 to 6 years -----	5.40	6.90	8.30	23.30	30.00	36.00
6 to 9 years -----	6.50	8.40	10.40	28.30	36.30	45.20
Girls, 9 to 12 years --	7.40	9.60	11.20	32.20	41.60	48.60
12 to 15 years -----	8.20	10.60	12.80	35.40	46.00	55.50
15 to 20 years -----	8.40	10.50	12.50	36.20	45.60	54.20
Boys, 9 to 12 years ---	7.60	9.80	11.80	32.90	42.40	51.10
12 to 15 years -----	8.90	11.70	13.90	38.40	50.50	60.10
15 to 20 years -----	10.20	13.00	15.60	44.10	56.10	67.70
Women, 20 to 35 years -	7.70	9.80	11.70	33.30	42.40	50.80
35 to 55 years -----	7.40	9.40	11.30	31.90	40.90	49.00
55 to 75 years -----	6.20	8.10	9.60	27.00	35.10	41.80
75 years and over ---	5.70	7.20	8.80	24.60	31.20	38.20
Pregnant -----	9.10	11.40	13.50	39.50	49.40	58.40
Nursing -----	10.50	13.10	15.30	45.70	56.80	66.40
Men, 20 to 35 years ---	8.80	11.20	14.00	38.20	48.70	60.70
35 to 55 years -----	8.20	10.50	12.80	35.50	45.30	55.30
55 to 75 years -----	7.30	9.50	11.40	31.60	41.10	49.50
75 years and over ---	6.80	9.10	11.00	29.60	39.60	47.70

1/ Estimates computed from quantities in food plans published in FAMILY ECONOMICS REVIEW, October 1964. Costs of the plans were first estimated by using average price per pound of each food group paid by urban survey families at 3 income levels in 1965. These prices were adjusted to current levels by use of Retail Food Prices by Cities, released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

2/ Persons of the first age listed up to but not including the second age.

3/ 10 percent added for family size adjustment.

4/ Man and woman, 20 to 35 years; children 1 to 3 and 3 to 6 years.

5/ Man and woman, 20 to 35 years; child 6 to 9; and boy 9 to 12 years.

6/ Costs given for persons in families of 4. For other size families, adjust thus: 1-person, add 20 percent; 2-person, add 10 percent; 3-person, add 5 percent; 5-person, subtract 5 percent; 6-or-more-person, subtract 10 percent.

Table 2.--Cost of 1 week's food at home estimated for food plans at 3 cost levels, December 1969, for Northeast and North Central Regions 1/

Sex-age groups 2/	Northeast			North Central		
	Low-cost plan	Moderate-cost plan	Liberal plan	Low-cost plan	Moderate-cost plan	Liberal plan
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
<u>FAMILIES</u>						
Family of two, 20 to 35 years 3/----	19.80	25.10	29.60	18.50	23.00	28.20
Family of two, 55 to 75 years 3/-----	16.20	21.00	24.40	15.30	19.10	23.00
Family of four, preschool children 4/	28.90	36.70	42.90	26.90	33.30	40.70
Family of four, school children 5/----	33.50	42.80	50.30	31.10	38.70	47.80
<u>INDIVIDUALS 6/</u>						
Children, under 1 year -----						
1 to 3 years -----	3.90	5.00	5.30	3.60	4.40	5.00
3 to 6 years -----	5.00	6.30	7.20	4.60	5.60	6.80
6 to 9 years -----	5.90	7.60	8.80	5.50	6.80	8.30
Girls, 9 to 12 years -----	7.20	9.20	11.00	6.60	8.20	10.40
12 to 15 years -----	8.10	10.60	11.80	7.60	9.40	11.20
15 to 20 years -----	9.00	11.70	13.60	8.30	10.40	12.80
Boys, 9 to 12 years -----	9.10	11.60	13.20	8.50	10.30	12.40
12 to 15 years -----	8.30	10.80	12.40	7.70	9.60	11.80
15 to 20 years -----	9.70	12.90	14.60	9.00	11.50	13.90
Women, 20 to 35 years -----	11.20	14.20	16.40	10.40	12.80	15.70
35 to 55 years -----	8.40	10.60	12.30	7.80	9.70	11.60
55 to 75 years -----	8.10	10.30	11.90	7.50	9.30	11.20
75 years and over -----	6.80	8.80	10.20	6.40	8.00	9.50
Pregnant -----	6.20	7.80	9.30	5.80	7.10	8.70
Nursing -----	9.90	12.40	14.10	9.30	11.30	13.40
Men, 20 to 35 years -----	11.50	14.30	16.10	10.80	12.90	15.30
35 to 55 years -----	9.60	12.20	14.60	9.00	11.20	14.00
55 to 75 years -----	9.00	11.40	13.40	8.40	10.40	12.80
75 years and over -----	7.90	10.30	12.00	7.50	9.40	11.40
	7.40	9.90	11.50	7.00	9.10	11.00

See footnotes 1 to 6 of table 1, p. 20.

Table 3.--Cost of 1 week's food at home estimated for food plans at 3 cost levels,
December 1969, for Southern and Western Regions 1/

Sex-age groups 2/	South				West		
	Low-cost plan	Another low-cost plan 7/	Moderate- cost plan	Liberal plan	Low-cost plan	Moderate- cost plan	Liberal plan
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
FAMILIES							
Family of two, 20 to 35 years 3/----	16.70	16.10	21.40	26.00	18.40	22.30	27.60
Family of two, 55 to 75 years 3/-----	13.60	12.90	18.00	21.30	15.10	18.70	22.60
Family of four, preschool children 4/	24.30	23.40	31.20	37.60	26.80	32.50	39.60
Family of four, school children 5/----	28.10	27.10	36.20	44.00	31.10	37.90	46.60
INDIVIDUALS 6/							
Children, under 1 year -----	3.30	3.20	4.20	4.70	3.60	4.30	4.80
1 to 3 years -----	4.20	4.00	5.30	6.30	4.60	5.50	6.50
3 to 6 years -----	4.90	4.80	6.40	7.70	5.50	6.70	8.00
6 to 9 years -----	6.00	5.90	7.70	9.60	6.60	8.10	10.10
Girls, 9 to 12 years -----	6.80	6.40	8.90	10.30	7.60	9.30	10.90
12 to 15 years -----	7.50	7.20	9.80	11.90	8.30	10.30	12.40
15 to 20 years -----	7.70	7.30	9.90	11.70	8.50	10.20	12.10
Boys, 9 to 12 years -----	6.90	6.60	9.00	10.80	7.80	9.50	11.40
12 to 15 years -----	8.10	7.90	10.70	12.70	9.00	11.20	13.30
15 to 20 years -----	9.30	8.90	11.90	14.30	10.40	12.50	15.10
35 to 55 years -----	6.80	6.50	8.80	10.50	7.50	9.10	11.00
55 to 75 years -----	5.70	5.30	7.60	8.90	6.30	7.80	9.40
75 years and over -----	5.20	4.90	6.80	8.20	5.70	7.00	8.60
Pregnant -----	8.40	8.20	10.60	12.40	9.20	11.00	13.10
Nursing -----	9.70	9.50	12.20	14.10	10.70	12.60	14.80
Men, 20 to 35 years -----	8.10	7.80	10.40	12.80	8.90	10.80	13.60
35 to 55 years -----	7.50	7.20	9.70	11.70	8.30	10.10	12.40
55 to 75 years -----	6.70	6.40	8.80	10.50	7.40	9.20	11.10
75 years and over -----	6.30	6.00	8.50	10.10	6.90	8.80	10.70

See footnotes 1 to 6 of table 1, p. 20.

7/ Special adaptation of low-cost plan especially suitable for food habits in the Southeastern States.

SOME NEW USDA PUBLICATIONS

(Please give your ZIP code in your return address when you order these.)

Single copies of the following are available free from the Office of Information,
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250:

- MEAT AND POULTRY--WHOLE SOME FOR YOU. HG No. 170.
- MEAT AND POULTRY--STANDARDS FOR YOU. HG No. 171.
- MEAT AND POULTRY--LABELED FOR YOU. HG No. 172.
- MEAT AND POULTRY--CLEAN FOR YOU. HG No. 173.
- MEAT AND POULTRY--CARE TIPS FOR YOU. HG No. 174.
- HOW TO BUY CANNED AND FROZEN VEGETABLES. HG No. 167.
- BUYING YOUR HOME SEWING MACHINE. (Revised) HG No. 38.

A single copy of the following is available free from the Consumer and Food
Economics Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Hyattsville, Md. 20782:

- CONSUMER AND FOOD ECONOMICS RESEARCH DIVISION--ORGANIZATION
AND PROGRAM

The following is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government
Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402:

- DIETARY LEVELS OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE NORTHEAST, SPRING 1965.
HFCS-7. \$1.00.

INDEX OF ARTICLES IN 1969 ISSUES

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Issue</u>
REGULAR FEATURES		
Consumer Prices -----	23	March
Consumer Prices -----	24	June
Consumer Prices -----	24	September
Consumer Prices -----	20	December
Cost of Food at Home -----	25	March
Cost of Food at Home -----	23	June
Cost of Food at Home -----	23	September
Cost of Food at Home -----	19	December
Some New USDA Publications -----	21	March
Some New USDA Publications -----	22	June
Some New USDA Publications -----	22	September
Some New USDA Publications -----	18	December
Index of Articles in 1968 Issues -----	22	March

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Issue</u>
CLOTHING AND TEXTILES		
Clothing and Textiles: Supplies, Prices, and Outlook for 1969 -----	16	March
Gifts and Handed-down Clothing Important in Family Wardrobes -----	3	September
FAMILY FINANCE		
Budget Guides -----	12	September
Budgets for Three Standards of Living for an Urban Family of Four -----	19	June
Issues in Income Maintenance Design -----	9	June
Poverty Statistics Revised -----	16	December
Saving by U.S. Households -----	5	June
Some Considerations in Family Credit Decisions ----	7	June
The Changing Income Distribution -----	13	June
"Truth-in-Lending" Goes into Effect -----	21	June
FOOD		
Changes Since 1964 in the Estimated Cost of Food for a Family -----	8	December
Comparing Costs of Fresh Vegetables and Fruits ---	9	December
Diets of Low-Income Families -----	3	March
Diets of Men, Women, and Children -----	7	March
Money Value and Adequacy of Diets Compared with the USDA Food Plans -----	6	September
New Developments in USDA Food Programs -----	10	March
Outlook for Food in 1969 -----	19	March
Salt Purchases by Families -----	12	December
The Cost of Chicken, Whole and Parts -----	22	September
The Nutritive Content of Type A School Lunches ----	3	June
Use of Apples by U.S. Households -----	9	September
Use of Vitamin and Mineral Supplements -----	5	June
HOUSING		
Home Mortgage Debt -----	16	September
New Programs in Rural Housing -----	13	March
Price Index Rises for New Houses -----	18	September
Second Homes in the United States -----	14	December
Survey of Occupants of New Housing Units -----	18	September
The Cost of Buying a Home -----	14	September
U. S. Housing in 1968 -----	13	December
MISCELLANEOUS		
Consumer Education Bibliography Available -----	22	June
Occupations of Women Workers -----	10	September
Rural Change - Perspective for the 1970's -----	17	June
Time Spent in Household Work by Homemakers ----	5	September
U. S. Families--Recent Census Findings -----	3	December

TO OUR READERS: Once in a while we need to evaluate the work we are doing, to find out if it is still meeting a need, and in the best way possible. We would appreciate your help in evaluating Family Economics Review. Will you please fill out this questionnaire and mail it to us? Detach along line at left and follow mailing directions on the reverse. No postage is required.

- (1) Listed below are regular features of Family Economics Review. Please indicate whether you use these by checking the appropriate box.

	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom or Never
Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Index of Prices Paid by Farmers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Table showing Cost of Food at Home U.S. average (quarterly)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional averages (annually)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
List of New USDA Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- (2) Please indicate below how many of the articles listed in the 1969 index (see opposite page) you read. Do NOT count the regular features listed in (1) above.

Clothing and Textiles _____	Housing _____
Family Finance _____	Miscellaneous _____
Food _____	

- (3) If you found any article or articles in the 1969 issues especially useful, please list:

- (4) Do you file Family Economics Review for future reference? Yes ___ No ___
Do you share it with others? Yes ___ No ___

- (5) What is your position: Extension worker: State ☐ County ☐ ;
Teacher: College ☐ High school ☐ ; Social welfare worker ☐ ;
Other _____.

- (6) If you have any suggestions for making Family Economics Review more useful, please write them on other side of page.

Thank you for taking time to fill out this questionnaire!

PLEASE FOLD AS INDICATED, SEAL WITH TAPE, AND MAIL THIS BACK TO US.
NO STAMP IS NECESSARY.

First Fold Line

Second Fold Line (Do not write below this line)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE
CONSUMER & FOOD ECONOMICS RESEARCH DIVISION
HYATTSVILLE, MARYLAND 20782

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300



POSTAGE & FEES PAID
United States Department of Agriculture

Family Economics Branch
Consumer & Food Economics Research Division, ARS
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Room 339, Federal Center Building
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

CONSUMER PRICES
Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers
(1957-59 = 100)

Group	Jan. 1969	Nov. 1969	Dec. 1969	Jan. 1970
All items -----	124.1	130.5	131.3	131.8
Food -----	122.0	128.1	129.9	130.7
Food at home -----	118.3	123.8	125.8	126.6
Food away from home -----	140.3	149.0	149.9	150.6
Housing -----	122.7	129.8	130.5	131.1
Shelter -----	128.2	137.7	138.5	139.6
Rent -----	116.9	120.5	121.0	121.3
Homeownership -----	132.7	144.5	145.4	146.8
Fuel and utilities -----	111.7	114.2	114.6	114.6
Fuel oil and coal -----	116.7	118.9	119.2	119.7
Gas and electricity -----	110.2	113.2	113.7	114.1
Household furnishings and operation -----	115.2	119.6	120.0	120.1
Apparel and upkeep -----	123.4	130.7	130.8	129.3
Men's and boys' -----	124.9	132.1	132.0	130.8
Women's and girls' -----	118.7	127.4	127.2	124.2
Footwear -----	136.3	143.9	144.4	144.4
Transportation -----	120.7	125.6	126.4	127.3
Private -----	117.9	122.7	123.4	123.3
Public -----	144.8	151.1	153.0	165.1
Health and recreation -----	133.3	139.1	139.6	140.1
Medical care -----	150.2	157.4	158.1	159.0
Personal care -----	123.7	127.8	128.1	128.5
Reading and recreation -----	128.4	132.3	132.7	133.1
Other goods and services -----	125.6	133.1	133.5	133.9

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Index of Prices Paid by Farmers for Family Living Items
(1957-59 = 100)

Item	Feb. 1969	Sept. 1969	Oct. 1969	Nov. 1969	Dec. 1969	Jan. 1970	Feb. 1970
All items -----	120	124	124	125	125	126	127
Food and tobacco -----	-	126	-	-	127	-	-
Clothing -----	-	141	-	-	143	-	-
Household operation -----	-	121	-	-	122	-	-
Household furnishings ---	-	106	-	-	107	-	-
Building materials, house -----	-	122	-	-	122	-	-

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service.

